REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims in the application are requested.

Status Of The Claims:

Upon entry of this Amendment claims 1 – 37 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 33 are independent claims. Claims 9 and 33 have been amended. Claims 38 – 44 have been added for additional protection. The specification has been amended to correct minor typographical errors.

Response To Information Disclosure Comments:

The Examiner's comments are noted. The reference is not cited in the specification and was included pursuant to the requirements of 37 CFR 1.56.

Response To The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a):

Claims 1, 26, 33-34 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Mandato et al. European Application 1130869 (Mandato).

Before responding to the rejection, applicants would like to distinguish Mandato from the present invention Heinonen, as follows:

1.   Mandato:

Mandato discloses a method for conveniently managing user profile information in a unified instant messaging system. The method operates on a data base structure, which accommodates in a flexible way subscribers' information. More specifically, this method takes into account the mutable characteristics of the environment where subscribers' devices are operating. Subscribers can in fact freely modify their personal user profiles as situations change and/or as they move to different geographical locations. Mandato fails to disclose limitations of Heinonen, as follows:

A.   **Mandato discloses storing user profiles in a remote central database capable of tracking a user's current state in terms of a location and logical context of the user and fails to disclose a mobile, wireless terminal creating, editing and storing user personalized profiles in the mobile terminal for access by inquiring terminals in a short-range communication system.**

Mandato teaches and discloses enabling subscribers of a system to be reachable by other subscribers independently of the current context, excluding e.g. location and terminal type limitations. This is provided by storing a user profile data in a remote central database, which comprises at least one user profile, which can be created, edited and/or deleted by the user. Each of the user profiles stored on the central database is associated with an environment of the user representing a physical location and/or logical context of the user for access by other subscribers.

In contrast, Heinonen discloses a mobile wireless terminal contains databases for storing standardized format profiles containing user contact information. Standardized format profiles of user interests and user or manufacturer-defined profiles. The personalized profiles are stored in the databases as a single record of a Service Discovery Protocol database. Screen display apparatus in the mobile terminal displays indexes and contents of the profiles for user access in creating, editing and storing user profiles. The mobile terminal includes apparatus responsive to SDP inquires from inquiring terminals for access to and acquisition of the user defined personalized profiles.

Mandato fails to disclose storing user profiles in databases located in a mobile terminal for inquiring terminals regarding activities and topics of interest to both terminal users.

B.   **Mandato discloses a user editing a profile in a remote central database and fails to disclose a user editing a profile in his mobile terminal.**

Mandato at paragraphs 38 and 59 discloses the database (1) comprises respectively for each user at least one customizable user profile which can be created, edited

and/or deleted by the user from his terminal. Each customizable user profile is associated with an environment of the user representing a physical location and/or a logical context of the user.

In contrast, Heinonen at page 6, lines 5 -15 discloses an index screen in the user's terminal, which enables the user to access a process screen for editing and removing keywords related to the processes. The editing and updating of Personal Profiles can be performed using the user interface of user's mobile terminal.

Mandato fails to disclose editing profiles stored in the user's terminal.

C.   Mandato disclose using profile information in the remote central database to direct messages to the user from inquiring terminals and fails to disclose transmitting user profiles from a wireless terminal to an inquiring terminal.

Mandato at paragraphs 157-159 discloses a Calling Party located in Moscow tries to send an IM to the businessman HJK (i.e. the Called Party), by connecting to the IMB System through a web interface (by using a PC with an Internet access). The Calling Party does not know where the businessman is currently located. All the Calling Party knows is the businessman's UN (e.g. HJK@sony.de). Based on the information stored in the User Profile Database, the IMB System resolves the businessman's (i) Active Context and (ii) the current terminal device. Once having such information, the IMB System can finally forward the IM (within the proper data format, as prescribed by the selected terminal device) to the Called Party.

In contrast, Heinonen at page 6, lines 16-23 discloses if the responding user's terminal has its personal profile response state set to "ON", then an inquiring terminal can make an SDP inquiry to request a Personal profile. The SDP inquiry accesses the responding user's terminal SDP database, which is divided into a phone book section containing the users personal profile and a more detailed data section for detailed personal information. The responding user's terminal responds in an SDP transaction to provide a standardized format for the requested information.

Mandato fails to disclose transmitting user profiles to an inquiring terminal.

D.   Mandato discloses subscribers transmitting standard IMails to terminals via an originating message gateway and fails to disclose an inquiring terminal transmitting SDP inquires to access user profiles.

Mandato at paragraph 91(3) discloses IMB subscribers directly inquire MB User Profile and Accounting information. Inquiry results are sent to the subscriber by using plain IMB functionality (e.g. Accounting information can be sent to the inquirer as a SMS message, if so preferred by the subscriber, according to his/her User Profile).

In contrast, Heinonen at page 6, lines 16-20 discloses an inquiring terminal can make an SDP inquiry to request a Personal profile. The SDP inquiry accesses the responding user's terminal SDP database, which is divided into a phone book section containing the users personal profile.

Mandato fails to disclose an inquiring terminal transmitting SDP inquiries for user information and the user terminal having a more detailed data section for personal information.

Summarizing, Mandato fails to disclose (1) storing user profiles in a database in a mobile terminal for access by inquiring terminals; (2) using the mobile terminal to edit profiles stored in the terminal; (3) transmitting profile information stored in the terminal from the terminal to an inquiring terminal, and (4) an inquiring terminal accessing user profile information stored in a mobile terminal, via an SDP inquiry. Without such disclosure, the rejection of claims 1, 26, 33-34, and 37 under 35 USC 102 (a) fails for lack of support in the prior art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 26, 33-34, and 37 are requested.

Now turning to the rejection applicants respond to the indicated paragraphs of the rejection, as follows:

Regarding Paragraph 6:

Mandato at paragraphs 80-85 and 91 describe an IMB User Profile database including IMB service user space and fails to disclose (i) installing user profiles in a database contained in a mobile terminal; (ii) editing the profile in the terminal under user control, and (iii) transmitting the profile to an inquiring terminal. Moreover, paragraphs 81 and 84 seem to teach away from Heinonen. Paragraph 81 teaches that the database maintaining user profile information is

- 15 -

information is implemented as a standalone database, which is not limited to any particular location or terminal device. This differs significantly from the teachings of Heinonen where user profile is stored in the terminal device. Paragraph 84 teaches that users can register with the user profile database for obtaining a unified identification and store information on the database, which differs significantly from the teachings of the present invention where the user of the mobile terminal is providing personalized information to others in a close proximity and is the one who controls access to the information by others.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 102 (a) is without support in the cited art and should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 1 is requested.

Regarding Paragraph 7:

Claim 26 further limits claim 1 and is patentable on the same basis as claim 1. Allowance of claim 26 is requested.

Regarding Paragraph 8:

Claim 33 now describes the terminal of claim 1 plus the further limitation of a screen display for displaying profiles to the user of the terminal for editing. Mandato at paragraph 38 discloses the user edits profiles displayed at the central database and not at the mobile terminal as disclosed in Heinonen.

The rejection of claim 33 under 35 USC 102 (a) is without support in the cited art and should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 33 is requested

Regarding Paragraph 9:

Mondato discloses the profile is stored in the remote central database. Heinonen discloses the profile is stored in a database contained in the mobile terminal.

The rejection of claim 34 under 35 USC 102 (a) is without support in the cited art and should be withdrawn. Allowance of claim 34 is requested.

Regarding Paragraph 10:

Claim 37 further limits claim 33 and is patentable on the same basis as claim 33. Allowance of claim 37 is requested.

Summarizing, Mondato fails to disclose the limitations of Claims 1, 26, 33, 34, and 37 for the reasons indicated above. Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 102 (a) and allowance of claims 1, 26, 33, 34 and 37 are requested.

Response To The Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

Claims 2-25, 27-32 and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandato in view of Haartsen "Bluetooth-The Universal Radio Interface For AD HOC, Wireless Connectivity" ("Haartsen").

Before responding to the rejections, applicants would like to comment on the combination of Mondato and Haartsen, as follows:

1.   Haartsen is an early disclosure of Bluetooth technology relating to the Bluetooth air interface; Pico nets; authentication, and encryption. There is no disclosure in Haartsen regarding

(i)   an SDP protocol and an SDP database;

(ii)   SDP database structure;

(iii)   data transmission (OBEX);

(iv)   push/pull technology

Haartsen does not supply the missing elements in Mondato with respect to the above claimed limitations.

Now turning to the rejection applicants respond to the indicated paragraphs of the rejection, as follows:

Regarding Paragraph 13:

Mondato at paragraph 157, describes a calling party located in Moscow sending an I-mail to a business man by connecting to an IMB system through a web interface using a pc with an Internet access. Bluetooth is Pico net-based and limited to 100 meters or less. Bluetooth implemented in IMB will not support the IMail functions of the IMB due to the limited coverage of the Pico net. A worker skilled in the art would not be able to implement IMB using

53644 v1

Bluetooth. Thus, the Examiner has not established any predictability of success in combining Mondato and Haartsen, as required in MPEP 2143.02.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 and allowance thereof are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 14:

Haartsen, at pgs. 114-115 discloses forming a Pico net and establishing master and slave units. Applicants can find no disclosure in Haartsen relating to setting the personalization state of a wireless terminal to be accessed by inquiring wireless terminals, as described in the specification at pg. 5, lines 20-24.

The combination of Mondato and Haartsen does not teach a worker skilled in the art, the implementation of claim 3. In any case, the combination of Mondato and Haartsen is inoperative for the reasons indicated in the consideration of claim 2.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 3 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 15:

Mandato, at paragraphs 97-109, describes the user profile database structure. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited paragraphs regarding installing a user's profile into service discovery protocol records.

Mondato fails to provide disclosure enabling a worker skilled in the art to implement claims 4 and 14. The rejection of claims 4 and 14 under 35 USC 103(a) fails for lack of support in the cited paragraphs.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 4 and 14 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 16:

Mondato, at paragraph 96, discloses the user profile database entries are identified by user's personal information, such as first, middle and last name, date of birth, place of birth, home address, and the like. Applicants can find no disclosure in paragraph 96 or in paragraph 97-109 relating to including a list of user interests in the SDP records. The records are stored in a user profile database, which does not describe storing records in a SDP database.

The rejection of claim 5 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 5 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 17:

Mandato, at paragraphs 97-109, describe as a default and an extended user profile implemented as properties, where each property key uniquely identifies a given property, and the property value corresponds to the given property content. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited paragraphs relating to characterizing specific interest of the user in bit masks. The Examiner's extrapolation of the cited paragraphs to describe bit mask characterizing each specific interest is believed to be speculation, which is not sufficient to serve as a basis for rejecting claim 6.

The rejection of claim 6 is without support in the cited art. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 6 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 18:

Mandato, at paragraphs 97-109, does not describe SDP records, as discussed in connection with the consideration of claim 5. There is no disclosure in paragraphs 97-109 to enable a worker skilled in the art to implement claim 7.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 7 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 19:

Claim 8 further limits claims 1 and 2 and is patentable on the same basis thereof.

Regarding Paragraph 20:

Mondato, at paragraph 91, discloses a UML Class Diagram and Computational View Point Diagrams related to the IMB service user's space; extended user profiles and default user profiles, all profiles stored at the central database. Claim 9 has been amended and now describes editing the personal profiles stored in the user's terminal by displaying an index screen in a user's terminal to enable a user to edit and update the personal profiles using an interface of the user terminal. Mondato describes editing the user profiles stored at the central database; whereas, Heinonen describes editing the user profile stored in a user's terminal.

The rejection of claim 9 is without support in the cited paragraphs. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 9 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 21:

Claim 10 further limits claims 1 and 2 from which it depends. Claim 10 is patentable on the same basis as claims 1 and 2.

Regarding Paragraph 22:

Mondato, at paragraphs 80-85, and specifically paragraph 82, describes an IMB user profile database included in the user profile database management system connected to the Internet, as shown in Fig. 6. In contrast, Heinonen discloses the database stored in the user's terminal, as shown in Fig. 2. Mondato fails to disclose dividing a database installed in the user's terminal into a phone book section and a more detailed data section.

There is no support from the cited paragraph for the rejection of claim 11 under 35 USC 103(a). Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 11 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 23:

Mondato, at paragraphs 80-82, discloses an IMB User Profile Database stored in a remote computer and fails to disclose a user's personal profile installed in the user's terminal and without such disclosure, there is no basis for the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103(a).

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 12 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 24:

Mondato, at paragraph 80-85 and 91, describes writing information into a central database and not into a database included in the user's terminal.

The cited paragraphs fail to disclose the limitation of claim 13.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 13 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 25:

Claims 15 and 17 further limit claims 1, 2 and 14 from which they depend and are patentable on the same basis as the claims from which they depend.

53644 v1

Regarding Paragraph 26:

Claim 16 further limits claims 1, 2, 14 and 15 from which it depends. Claim 16 is patentable on the same basis as the claims from which it depends.

Regarding Paragraph 27:

Mandato at paragraphs 80-85 and paragraph 91 discloses the IMB User Profile Database and the IMB Service User Space, respectively, and fails to disclose transferring information to an inquiring wireless terminal. The Examiner acknowledges the failure of the art to describe push/pull delivery systems, and takes official notice of such systems. First, applicants request the Examiner cite a reference in support of the official notice taken in connection with the rejection of claims 18-20 and claim 23. Second, at best Mandato describes push/pull between a remote central database and a user, not between a wireless device and an inquiring device, as described in claims 18-20 and 23.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 18-20 and 23 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 28:

Claims 21-22 and 24-25 further limit claim 1 from which they depend and are patentable on the same basis thereof. Also, the combination of Mondato and Haartsen is in operative for the reasons indicated in connection with the consideration of claim 2.

Regarding Paragraph 29:

Claim 27 further limits claims 1 and 26 from which it depends. Claim 27 is patentable on the same basis as the claims from which it depends.

Regarding Paragraph 30:

Haartsen, at page 115, discloses establishing connection regardless of user qualification. Mondato, in Fig. 1, discloses the architectural components of a unified instant messaging system. Fig. 9 discloses the details of the instant message broker system from a computational viewpoint. Applicants can find no disclosure in Fig. 1 and Fig. 9 relating to checking user qualifications for matching making purposes.

53644 v1

There is no support in the references for the rejection of claim 28. In any case, claim 28 is patentable on the same basis as claims 1, 26 and 27 from which it depends.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 28 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 31:

Applicants can find no disclosure in Mondato and Haartsen regarding obtaining a PIN to enable a Bluetooth authentication procedure. Without such disclosure, there is no support in the references for the rejection of claim 29. In any case, claim 29 further limits claims 1 and 27 from which it depends, and is patentable on the same basis thereof. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 29 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 32:

Mondato, in paragraphs 34 and 91, describes message authentication and privacy and IMB service user space including extended user profiles and default user profiles. Applicants can find no disclosure in the cited paragraphs relative to a wireless terminal sharing information in its database with an inquiring terminal for two different levels of profile matching and pre-defined tolerances. Without such disclosure there is no support in paragraphs 34 and 91 for rejection of claims 30-32 under 35 USC 103(a). Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 30-32 are requested.

Regarding Paragraph 33:

Applicants request the Examiner to cite a reference in regard to taking official notice of permitting access to a terminal as a personalization apparatus.

In any case, claim 35 depends from claim 33 and patentable on the same basis thereof.

Regarding Paragraph 34:

Haartsen, at page 110, 114-115, describes the Bluetooth protocol without regard to matching personal profiles. The rejection of claim 36 is without support in the cited pages. Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claim 36 are requested.

Summarizing claims 2-25, 27-32 and 35-36 include elements not disclosed or suggested in Mondato, in view of Haartsen. The combination of reference, fails to disclose i) installing

profiles into service discovery protocol records; ii) editing and updating personal profiles stored in the terminal using a user interface; and iii) using a push or pull model to provide information to an inquiring wireless terminal.

Patentability support for New Claims 38 – 44:

Claims 38 - 44 describe a system of a wireless device and an inquiring deice interacting where the wireless device transfers user personal information to the inquiring device when the wireless device is set in a personalization state. Mandato describes a user interacting with a remote database to receive IMail from a subscriber in an IMB system. Haartsen disclose linking two wireless devices. The references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose a method or a terminal or a system for a user's short-range terminal sharing the user's personal profile with an inquiring wireless terminal in a wireless network when the user's terminal is set in a personalization state and the inquiring wireless terminal accesses the information, via a service discovery protocol.

No new matter is incorporated into claims 38-44. Entry and allowance of claims 38-44 are requested.

Further Supporting Reasons for the Patentability of Claims 1-38:

A.   Mandato requires some form of continuous communication connection between the user terminal devices and the user profile database, which exhausts connectivity resources and requires lots of analyzation and processing to in order to keep track of the current context of the user in view of location and terminal aspects.

In contrast, Heinonen is directed to maintaining and sharing user personal profile information with encountering devices within a short-range communication coverage of the terminal.

B.   Neither Mandato nor Haartsen maintain personal profile information at least partly on SDP records. Thus, the personal profile information is shared with encountered devices during a connection set-up stage between the terminals.

C.   Neither Mondato nor Haartsen disclose personal profile information may include at least two separate layers, wherein the first one is available to all encountering devices that are

within short-range coverage area, and the second is available only to devices that have a personal profile matching with the first layer personal profile information of the user terminal.

        D.   Neither Mondato nor Haartsen disclose a user of the mobile terminal has full control of the information in the personal profile. If the user sets the personal profile OFF. then no information is available to other terminals.

53644 v1

CONCLUSION:

Having distinguished the claims 1-37 from the cited art, and supported the patentability of New Claims 38-44, applicants request entry of the amendment, allowance of the claims and passage to issue of the application.

AUTHORIZATION:

The undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge all required fees, fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17, or all required extension of time fees for this paper to Deposit Account Number 13-4503, Order 4208-4064.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.

Date: September 14, 2004   By: _Joseph C. Redmond_

Joseph C. Redmond, Jr.
Registration Number: 18,753

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS:
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P.
3 World Financial Center
New York, New York 10281-2101
202-857-7887– phone
202-857-7929 – fax

53644 v1